TED MUN 22

**Country:Nepal**

**Committee:WHO**

Agenda Item:Legalization of Euthanasia

**Euthanasia is a very debated topic, especially in the context of medical ethics. In general, its meaning is to end patient's end of the life in certain situations. The effectiveness of euthanasia has not established, although it has been use in some cases. As the delegation of Nepal ; we are aware that the Hindu faith is practiced by the vast majority of my people (85%). Buddhists make up 10% of the population, while Muslims make up 5%. Although these beliefs are seen as different around the world, they share an important aspect. Human life and the human body are considered sacred in the same way. According to these views, euthanasia and similar concepts are not suitable for belief. In the heart of Buddhism, the monks of the Buddha (theravada, the teaching of the elders, or the ancient teaching) say that "when caring for incurably ill people, it is forbidden to behave in such a way as to hasten the death of these people." In other words, euthanasia is not in accordance with this belief. The concept of euthanasia is also not considered appropriate for our Muslim people. As a country, we do not find these demands that devalue human life appropriate. Issues such as euthanasia or other controversial health-related practices require a certain level of research and discussion, as they are more than a cure. In addition, in this particular case, we will have further discussions and exchanges of views within the WHO committee in order to reach a conclusion on the October agenda item mentioned above. Given that the main goal of the WHO is to achieve the highest level of health on common ground, such discussions are equally included in WHO policies as emergencies. We wholeheartedly believe that the target will be achieved for related reasons within the committee. As Nepal, we want to declare that we do not support the legalization of euthanasia.**

**We do not think that such a practice would be acceptable given the real state of health in the world. We also concluded that euthanasia is a risky practice that should not be put into practice. We are also aware that the world is changing and growing, especially in terms of medical technology, but unfortunately, it will not reduce the dangers associated with assisted suicide, neither as a cause nor as a preventive practice. As a result, we think that at the end of this committee, all member states will determine whether euthanasia should be made legal or not. We have already said that we are against this kind of behavior. Euthanasia, in our opinion, is not the most ethical or humane option for improving the quality of life of a suffering patient. In addition, from the comments of physicians and other medical specialists on this issue, could be concluded that such an activity requires huge responsibility and common sense and poses a problem. Statistics on the issue of euthanasia in society also show that most people want the legislation to remain in force and assisted suicide to still illegal. If there is no demand, it is pointless to take such huge risks. We believe that we have expressed our current concerns.**

**But what should be done in terms of solutions? In order to avoid misunderstandings, this issue needs to resolved by international law. All signatory states should enact this law and be as specific as possible. Maintaining access to ethical and rational health care should be our primary goal.**